DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 375 728 HE 027 812

AUTHOR Bean, John P.; Vesper, Nick
TITLE Gender Differences in College Student Satisfaction. ASHE Annual Meeting Paper.
PUB DATE Nov 94
NOTE 33p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education (19th, Tucson, AZ, November 10-13, 1994).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Persistence; Career Choice; College Freshmen; *College Sophomores; College Students; *Females; Higher Education; Majors (Students); *Males; *Sex Differences; State Universities; *Student Attitudes; Student College Relationship
IDENTIFIERS *ASHE Annual Meeting; *Student Satisfaction

ABSTRACT

This study assessed gender differences in student satisfaction with college to further understand what contributes to student persistence and student outcomes. The study gathered data from 494 first and second year honors students (1,000 were originally surveyed) at a large midwestern research university. Of these, 175 were male and 319 were female. The analysis found that contact with advisors, having friends, and living on campus were significantly related to satisfaction for females but not for males. However, faculty contact, expected to be an important form of social interaction, was not significant to either group. Encouragement of parents, father's educational level, and choice of major and occupational certainty were significantly related to satisfaction for men but not women. Choice of major and occupational certainty were the most significant factors identified but only for men. Confidence in being a student and having attractive courses were important for both genders. Includes three tables. (Contains 38 references.) (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED375728

Gender Differences in College Student Satisfaction

John P. Bean
Higher Education and Student Affairs
School of Education
Indiana University
Bloomington, IN 47405
bean@indiana.edu

Nick Vesper
Indiana Education Policy Center
School of Education Office
Indiana University
Bloomington, IN 47405
vespern@indiana.edu

Prepared for the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Tuscon, Arizona, November, 1994.

HE027812

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

ASHE

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ASSOCIATION
FOR THE
STUDY OF
HIGHER EDUCATION

Texas A&M University
Department of Educational
Administration
College Station, TX 77843
(409) 845-0393

This paper was presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education held at the Doubletree Hotel, Tucson, Arizona, November 10-13, 1994. This paper was reviewed by ASHE and was judged to be of high quality and of interest to others concerned with the research of higher education. It has therefore been selected to be included in the ERIC collection of ASHE conference papers.

ABSTRACT

Data gathered from 494 first year and second year honors students were used to identify factors associated with college students satisfaction, a concept Astin (1977) considered subordinate to no other outcome from college. Based on the work of Gilligan (1982) and Belenky et. al (1986), we expected differences in the factors that affect satisfaction for men and women. The factors accounted for about a third of the variance for both males and females, but differences based on gender were observed: Fathers' education and parental encouragement were significant for males; institutional quality, having on-campus friends, and living on campus were significant for females.

Gender Differences in College Student Satisfaction

Introduction. Student satisfaction with college has been considered an important outcome from college (Spady, 1970; Bean, 1983; Astin, 1977). In fact, Astin, cited in Knox, Lindsay, and Kolb (1992) wrote that "it is difficult to argue that student satisfaction can be legitimately subordinated to any other educational outcome" (p. 164). With this kind of endorsement, it seems curious that Pascarella and Terenzini (1991) virtually ignored the outcome (at least by name) and does not appear in Baird's (1988) "map" of college education.

Recent scholarly research on college student satisfaction falls into two areas: measurement (Reed, Lahey & Downey, 1984; Polcyn, 1986; Cooper and Bradshaw, 1984; DeVore and Handal, 1981; Staats and Partlo, 1990; Orpen, 1990) and theory (Bean & Bradley, 1986; Pike, 1991, 1993; Winteler, 1983; Okun, Ruehlman, Karoly, 1991). In this study we rely on previous theory, particularly Bean and Bradley (1986), to identify the expected relationship between the independent variables and satisfaction, but our primary interest here is to identify differences between men and women in the factors that affect satisfaction.

Much institutional research on college students has been driven by institutional needs for retaining students, by background characteristics related to marketing, and by outcomes that can be used to legitimatize institutional practices. Indeed, most research comes from a single institution and is

often justified because it is useful in policy making for that school. Studies have often focused on academically marginal students, minority students, or part-time students. With the exception of the *Project Talent* research conducted by Astin, there have been few studies of excellent students.

In the current study we take the stand that if we are to have a "good society," (Bellah, et. al., 1985, 1991) then creating environments that are satisfying to students at all levels of academic performance is an ethical obligation of institutions. Moreover, pluralistic values call for the inclusion in higher education of students of varying performance levels, including honors students. Understanding the satisfaction of these students is no less important than understanding that of special groups or students less well prepared for college. Hence, this research focuses on the factors that influence the level of honors student satisfaction.

Theoretical Background. Satisfaction was a central intervening variable in Spady's (1971) model of student retention and Bean's (1980; 1983) organizational model of student attrition. It has usually been found to be related to retention (Munro, 1981; Pascarella and Chapman, 1983; Pascarella, Smart and Ethington, 1986; Metzner, 1989). However, it is necessary to separate studies that use satisfaction as a dependent variable from those that use "satisfaction with..." as a part of a study's approach to measurement of independent variables (e.g., Cabrera's, 1990, use of "satisfaction with faculty" as an

independent variable or Stinson, Scherer and Walter's (1987) social satisfaction scale or Pascarella, Terenzini and Wolfle's (1986) use of "I am satisfied with my intellectual development..."). This study uses satisfaction with college as the criterion or dependent variable.

The work of Bean and Bradley (1986) and Pike (1989; 1991) focused on satisfaction as the key outcome variable, although its reciprocal relationship with academic performance was also evaluated. Since our study uses students with a narrow but high range of academic achievement (honors students) such a relationship was not pursued. This study uses the same theoretical relationships described in Bean and Bradley as the basis for the relationship between the independent variables and satisfaction as the criterion variables (Based on Rand, 1964; Bentler and Speckart, 1979; Fishbein and Ajzen, 1975): In each case, experience is linked to an attitudinal or evaluative outcome. These relationships are similar to a student's experience of college and their evaluation of that experience in terms of their level of satisfaction. We go further, since we expect differences in the factors affecting satisfaction by gender.

Gender Differences. We hypothesize two gender-based differences in the factors affecting satisfaction based on the work of Gilligan (1982), Noddings (1984), and Belenky, et. al. (1986). First, Gilligan and Belenky found that women think of themselves as deeply involved in a web of social relationships.

So, we hypothesize that social/relational factors should be have greater effects on satisfaction for women than for men. Second, Noddings suggests that for women joy, which includes joy in intellectual work, is a basic reality. While we do not equate student satisfaction with joy, we make an assumption that joyful students would also be satisfied students. Hence, we hypothesize that more factors should be related to satisfaction for women than men. The third hypothesis is that career factors will influence satisfaction more for men than women. We hope to disconfirm this hypothesis. Twenty-five years ago, research, or the lack of it, would have suggested that career factors would have been more influential for men than women, but we believe society has changed and both men and women attend college with careers in mind. If the hypothesis were supported, it would suggest that the general stereotype that men are more rational/instrumental in their action may hold true for this group of Midwestern students.

The Model. The model estimated in this study indicates that for both men and women student satisfaction is a function of three general constructs: the student's background, the academic and institutional environment, and the social environment. The supposition of the model is that there is a relationship between each independent variable and student satisfaction. Each of the eleven independent variables could be used in the following form: [variable] is related to student satisfaction. Measurement of the manifest variables used in this study is based on an

instrument successfully used in retention studies since 1980 (Bean, 1980, 1982, 1983, 1985, 1990). Thus, the criterion variable, Satisfaction with being a college students, labelled SAT, was tested as a *linear* function of three sets of variables that represent the three underlying constructs in the model:

Student Background: Parental Encouragement ENCPAR; Certainty of Funding FIN; Father's Education POPED.

Academic and Institutional Environment: Confidence in Abilities CON; Perception of Institutional Quality INSTQUAL; Major and Career Certainty MOCERT; Get Courses and Find Them Exciting COURSEOK; Live on or off Campus ONCAMPUS.

Social/Relational Environment: Contact with Advisors ADVCON; Contact with Faculty FACCON; Friends on Campus and not off campus FRIEND.

To return to the gender-based hypotheses:

1. Social relational factors will have greater effects on satisfaction for women than men. We will consider this hypothesis supported if ADVCON, FACCON, and FRIEND have statistically significant and larger unstandardized regression coefficients for women than men. ENCPAR and ONCAMPUS also have a social component and will be examined in terms of this hypothesis as well.

2. More factors will be related to satisfaction for women than men. We will consider this hypothesis supported if more variables have statistically significant relationships to

satisfaction for women than men, if the adjusted R squared is larger for women than for men, and if the mean level of satisfaction is significantly higher for women than men.

3. Career factors will influence satisfaction for men more than for women. We would consider this hypothesis supported if the regression coefficient for MOCERT (major and occupational certainty) was significant for males and not females and larger for males than females, and disconfirmed otherwise.

All variables except ONCAMPUS are continuous with low to high values meaning low to high attributes (e.g., FIN ranges from very uncertain of funding to very certain). Literature supporting the inclusion of variables similar to the ones estimated in this model was presented elsewhere (Bean and Bradley, 1986). Table 1 describes the variables in more detail.

[Insert Table 1 about here]

Site, Sample, and Data Collection. Over 1000 freshman and sophomore honors students at a large Midwestern research university received surveys in the spring of 1991. Surveys were gathered from 560 students of which 540 were usable (96.4%). Twenty students were eliminated from the analysis because they were older than 22 and hence were not typical undergraduates. From 29 separate survey items, many variables were combined using a Cronbach's Alpha > .75 for reliability. After preparing the scales based on individual items there were 494 usable surveys, 175 males and 319 females. See Table 1 for a list of the combined questions used in developing the scales.

The rate of return for the questionnaires was 47%. An attempt was made to find out if the responses for several important questions in the study differed between those honors students who returned questionnaires and those who did not. Twenty honors students who did not return surveys were selected at random and telephoned. They were asked six questions from the survey related to gender, their college GPA, intent to leave, the practical value of education, satisfaction, and their sense of belonging at the institution. These responses were combined with sample data and subjected to statistical tests for differences: In no case was there a statistically significant difference between the responses of the analyzed sample and the students who had not responded to the questionnaire.

Honors students in this study had a GPA of 3.54 which was significantly higher than the GPA for freshman as a whole (about 2.8). Students in the sample were 65% women and 35% men while all freshmen are 54% women and 46% men. Their average age was 18.5. The sample was 89% White and 8% Asian and 4% other. None were married. About 62% were from in-state and the median distance they lived from campus was 190 miles. These students came primarily from towns or cities where the average size of their high school graduating class was 308. More than 86% lived in the residence halls. They reported that they were very likely to stay enrolled the following semester, felt highly attached to the institution, were quite satisfied to be students, and had an actual average cumulative GPA of 3.54. Nearly 85% of them

planned to attain degrees beyond the B.A. or B.S. Compared to all freshmen at the institution, the sample over-represented women and high ability students. However, these characteristics may be typical of honors students. Table 2 lists means and standard deviations for the sample.

[Insert Table 2 about here]

Methods and Findings.

Two methods were used to analyze the data: t-tests to examine average differences between males and females for each of the model variables; and ordinary least squares (OLS) regression to separately evaluate the model for each group.

T-tests. T-tests showed that except for the criterion variable SAT, the satisfaction of being a student, there were no differences in the mean responses for males and females. SAT was higher for females than males at p=.008. (Table 2 shows the means for each group but the t-tests are otherwise not reported). Thus, on average, males and females received the same encouragement to attend the institution, expressed the same certainty about funding, and came from families in which their fathers had the same level of education. Moreover, males and females had the same housing arrangements, were equally confident in their academic abilities, perceptions of institutional quality, certainty of majors and careers, and excited by their courses. Finally, their interactions with advisors, faculty, and friends was the same. Thus, except for satisfaction, an average male honors student and an average female honors student were

indistinguishable on the means and standard deviations of the model variables.

OLS. A regression using OLS was run for each group, females and males. Table 3 lists the 11 independent variables, the model R^2, adjusted and unadjusted, the B or unstandardized regression coefficients, the β (beta) weights, and the significance level of the hypothesized relationships.

[Insert Table 3 about here]

As shown in the table, the adjusted R^2 for each group is reasonably high (.31 for males, .32 for females). Hence the linear model reasonably explains the satisfaction of both male and female honors students with about the same accuracy. However, there are differences when each of the model variables are examined.

Student Background: The only background variable significant for females was certainty of funding (beta=.12) whereas father's education (.20) and parental encouragement (.18) were both significant for males but certainty of funding was not.

Academic and Institutional Environment: Confidence in abilities was significant for both males (beta=.20) and females (.23), and getting the right courses and finding them exciting was significant for both males (.20) and females (.27). The perception of institutional quality was significant only for females (.16), whereas major and career certainty was significant

only for males (.22). Living on campus was significant only for females (.17).

Social/Relational Environment: Contact with advisors was significant for females (beta=.14) as was living on campus (.16), but contact with faculty was not. None of these variables was significantly related to satisfaction for males.

Comparisons of the OLS weights. We are well aware of the statistical requirements of making between group comparisons of coefficients and of the differences in coefficients which might be due to different N. Moreover, except for the possible exceptions of POPED and ONCAMPUS, the metrics for the variables are arbitrary (as is the case in much educational research). However, we do think useful statements can be made about the differences in the coefficients between males and females.

Note first that except for CON and COURSEOK (and FACCON which matters for neither group), the remaining variables are significant for males or females but not both. Hence we can talk about them at will with respect to the appropriate group. For example, whatever we say about POPED matters only for males. Since the average of POPED is about 5.0 (which corresponds to completion of a college degree), an increase of 1 to the response 'Completed a graduate degree' (and holding everything else constant), absolute SAT will increase by 0.12--the B or raw coefficient of POPED--for males but not change at all for females. Thus a father with a graduate degree might see his

son's satisfaction increase by less than 3% of the average. Hardly a large amount.

The situation for CON and COURSEOK is not as simple since they are significant variables for both groups. But we can say some things if we assume that CON and COURSEOK do in fact satisfy the regression assumption that they have bivariate normal distributions. (They indeed are very close to being normal).

Consider the beta weights from Table 3:

	Male	Female
CON	.204	.233
COURSEOK	.197	.273

The variables count about the same for males: an increase of a standard deviation in either one will increase SAT by about .20 of the male's standard deviation. But there is a slight difference for females with COURSEOK counting for slightly more than CON. Hence with confidence in academic abilities as the base and standard deviations as the metric, "pushing" females towards <u>their</u> margin on a normal curve by increasing COURSEOK pushes them closer to their limit on SAT than a comparable push on COURSEOK for males would push them to their limit on SAT. Hence relatively speaking, and with a student at the same relative "normal curve" position on CON, changes in COURSEOK push females higher on their curve than males.

In terms of relative positions on their respective normal curves, again with standard deviations as the metric, it is

possible to go one step more. Increasing CON by a standard deviation for males and females increases SAT by .204 and .233 standard deviations respectively. Thus both males and females more up their normal curves towards the extreme about the same (with a slight edge to females). But if CON is held constant, moving males and females up their normal curves on COURSEOK moves females up .273 on SAT but males only .197 standard deviations on their respective normal curves. Hence relative to their counterparts--the average male and the average female at the center of the normal curve--a particular female would profit more from an increase in getting the right courses than a male would. Indeed, a male would increase up the curve only about 20% whereas a female would increase about 27%. Obviously, moving a female up the normal curve might not be an impressive move given the actual/raw values of the variables, especially for satisfaction where a standard deviation change might not amount to much in absolute terms. But relative to her "sisters" the change would be meaningful, whereas for males and their "brothers" the changes would not be so great.

Consider now the raw or B weights from Table 3:

	Male	Female
CON	.253	.228
COURSEOK	.309	.290

We can write two equations,

Male SAT = .253*CON + .309*COURSEOK + Constant

Female SAT = .228*CON + .290*COURSEOK + Konstant

where we can think that on all other variables, the students are at their "averages" (which nicely happens to be the same for males and females).

Since on average males and females look the same on the two variables (where CON is about 3.8 and COURSEOK about 3.7 on the original survey metrics for each group), we can say something about absolute changes in satisfaction away from the mythical "average student." If a male and female student think the same about their abilities (CON is the same for both of them), but each is moved along the COURSEOK curve to COURSEOK + 1, we have two new levels of satisfaction in terms of the old:

New Male SAT = .309 + Old Male SAT

New Female SAT = .290 + Old Female SAT

In absolute terms, male satisfaction will increase slightly more than female satisfaction. Assuming that the absolute scale measuring satisfaction has meaning beyond its relative meaning for both groups -- as described by standard deviations and normal curves -- changes in COURSEOK have a larger absolute impact for males than females but not by much. Similarly, there would be only a slight difference in the absolute change in SAT if COURSEOK is the same for both groups but CON is increased by the survey metric of 1. The changes are .253 or so for males and .228 or so for females. But corresponding relative changes in standard deviation units are .204 for males and .233 for females.

For those variables which determine SAT for both males and females, appropriate changes in absolute survey metrics of CON or

COURSEOK tend to favor males. In terms of relative changes and positions within their own group, changes tend to favor females.

Discussion and Implications. In terms of the gender-based hypotheses, we found support for each. The first hypothesis, that social/relational factors should have greater effects on satisfaction for women than for men, was supported in three out of four instances where relationships were statistically significant. Contact with advisors, having friends, and living on campus were significantly related to satisfaction for females and not males. This finding was consistent with expectations about the importance of relational factors for women based on Gilligan (1982) and Belenky, et. al. (1986). However, faculty contact, expected to be an important form of social interaction for students (Pascarella, 1980; Pascarella and Terenzini, 1991) was not significant for either group in producing satisfaction. A probably explanation is that the distribution of the variable was irregular; few students had out of class contacts with faculty. Encouragement of parents, another variable that could be considered relational, was significant for satisfaction for men but not women. Based on previous retention research (Bean and Vesper, 1992) such a finding would be unexpected since in that case parental encouragement had several indirect effects on retention for both men and women. Perhaps this finding results from the question which failed to distinguish between encouragement of mother and encouragement of father. Father's

education is significant for males and not females, so such a gender-based parental distinction may be important in terms of encouragement as well. Nonetheless, more social factors influenced satisfaction for women than men.

The second gender-based hypothesis was that more factors would be related to satisfaction for women than for men. This hypothesis was confirmed: more factors were significantly related to satisfaction for women (7 significant) than men (5 significant). However, since the N for women was 319 and for men was 175 and power is related to sample size, we have little confidence in this finding. This caveat is coupled with the fact that for these students the adjusted R squared for each group was similar (males, .313; females .322). For this sample there was little evidence that the factors predicting satisfaction was more numerous for women and explained more variance. The t-test for mean differences did indicate that women were more satisfied with being students than men; a finding one would expect based on Nodding's (1984) research.

The third gender-based hypothesis was that career factors would influence student satisfaction more for men than for women. This hypothesis was supported by the finding that major and occupational certainty were significantly related to satisfaction for men but not women. In fact, for men, major and occupational certainty had the largest effect of any variable on satisfaction while for women there was not affect at all. At

least for this group of students, the stereotype of the career-oriented male was upheld.

In terms of the effects on satisfaction for the individual variables, two were important for both genders: confidence in being a student and having attractive courses. Faculty members play the most critical role in both of those variables of any group of actors on campus since they can strip away the confidence of students or build up their confidence (Sandler, 1991). And it is the faculty who are responsible for making courses relevant and exciting. Thus, while informal contact with faculty seems to have little effect on students' levels of satisfaction in their 1st and 2nd years, their **formal** contact with faculty is extremely important during this time.

For men, each of the five variables related to satisfaction (ENCPAR, POPED, CON ,MOCERT, COURSEOK) had a similar-sized effect on satisfaction. For women, COURSEOK and CON had larger effects than the other five variables (ONCAMPUS, FRIEND, INSTQUAL, ADVCON, FIN). While the selection of the variables for the study made sense (10 of 11 were significantly related to satisfaction for either men or women), only two variables were significant for both groups (CON and COURSEOK). Two conclusions can be drawn from this finding: different factors affect satisfaction for men and for women; and the underlying model seems generally correct in identifying factors related to student satisfaction. Of course, since 2/3rd of the variance remains unexplained, we would not claim this to be a definitive model.

Limitations and Implications. While we have pointed out several of the limitations of this study in passing, it seems a propitious act to remind the reader that generalization from this kind of study must be done with requisite caution. To the extent that the students you are concerned with match the characteristics of this sample -- Midwestern, academic achievers, research university freshmen and sophomores -- you may have similar students. It is not sensible, however, to expect any single student to behave in the manner we have presented. Rather, the variables found to be significant are sensible starting places for influencing policy or at least alerting concerned people to possibilities for enhancing student satisfaction.

In terms of practical recommendations the following suggestions are made:

1. Men and women students are satisfied for different reasons. Any program set up to enhance satisfaction should take these differences into account.

2. If your institution provides the curriculum (courses and their delivery) in a manner students find exciting and stimulating, this, more than any other factor, should enhance student satisfaction. The effects should be slightly more pronounced for women than men. This is a gratifying result since too often students are assumed to be uninterested in academics.

3. Programs that enhance the social integration of women should increase satisfaction for women.

4. Programs that connect school to work and which help students find majors and potential careers, should enhance the satisfaction of men but not women.

5. Programs that relieve student's concern about financing school should increase satisfaction for women but not men.

Besides being of theoretical interest, the results show that institutions wanting to increase student satisfaction must do so in different ways depending on gender. For example, certainty of funding being significant for females might be mean targeting females for more financial aid or working closer with them to reduce their anxiety over money; or the effect from contact with advisors might mean training advisors to respond to females and males differently; and the effect of major certainty on males might mean better career advising for males.

Future research might consider the same model on non-honors students. It is not obvious what difference being an honors student makes for the model. It might be the case that background characteristics would matter more for non-honors students since the general population would be less homogeneous. Finally, a qualitative study of student satisfaction should augment our understanding of *how* the variables studied here and similar factors enhance satisfaction for both men and women.

References

Astin, A. W. (1977). Four critical years. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Baird, L.L. (1988). "A Map of Postsecondary Assessment." Research in Higher Education. Vol 28. No. 2. Pp 99-115.

Bean, J. P. (1985). Interaction Effects Based on Class Level in an Explanatory Model of College Student Dropout Syndrome. American Educational Research Journal, 22, 35-64.

Bean, J. P. (1983). The Application of a Model of Turnover in Work Organizations to the Student Attrition Process. Review of Higher Education, 6, 129-148.

Bean, J. P. (1982). Conceptual Models of Student Attrition: How Theory Can Help the Institutional Researcher, in Pascarella, E.T. (Ed.), New Directions for Institutional Research: Studying Student Attrition, no. 36. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bean, J. P. (1980). Dropouts and Turnover: The Synthesis of a Causal Model of Student Attrition. Research in Higher Education,

Bean, J. P. and Bradley, R. K. (1986). "Untangling the satisfaction-performance relationship for college students." Journal of Higher Education, 57, 393-412.

Bean, J.P. and Vesper, N. "Student Dependency Theory: An explanation of Student Retention in College." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Minneapolis, MN, 1992.

Belenky, M.F., Clinchy, B.M., Goldberger, N.R., & Tarule, J.M. (1986). Women's Ways of Knowing: The development of Self, Voice, and Mind. New York: Basic Books.

Bellah, R.N., Madsen, R., Sullivan , W.M., Swindler, A., & Tipton, S.M. (1991). The Good Society. New York: Knopf.

Bellah, R.N., Madsen, R., Sullivan , W.M., Swindler, A., & Tipton, S.M. (1985). Habits of the Heart. New York: Knopf.

Bentler, P. M. and Speckart, G. (1979). Models of attitude-behavior relations. Educational Research Journal, 22. 35-64.

Cabrera, A. F., Stampen, J.O., & Hansen, W.L. (1990) The Review of Higher Education, 13, 303-336.

Cooper, C. & Bradshaw, R. (1984) "How green is your academic climate? Check it out with MOSS: A monitor of student satisfaction. College and University, 59, 251-60.

DeVore, J. & Handal, P. (1981) "The college student satisfaction questionnaire: A test-retest reliability study." Journal of college Student Personnel, 22, 299-301.

Fishbein, M. and Ajzen, I. (1975). Belief, attitude, intention, and behavior: An introduction to theory and research. Reading, MA.: Addison-Wesley.

Gilligan, C. (1982) In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Knox, W. E., Lindsay, P., & Kolb, M.N. (1992) "Higher education, college characteristics an student experiences: Long-term effects on educational satisfactions and perceptions. Journal of Higher Education, 63, 303-28.

Metzner, B. (1989) "Perceived quality of academic advising: The effect on freshman attrition. American Educational Research Journal, 26, 422-442.

Munro, B. H. (1981). "Dropouts from higher education: Path analysis of a national sample. American Educational Research Journal, 18, 133-141.

Okun, M., Ruehlman, L., & Karoly, P. (1991) "Application of investment theory to predicting part-time community college student intent and institutional persistence/departure behavior. Journal of Educational Psychology, 83, 212-220.

Orpen, C. (1990) "The measurement of Student University Satisfaction: A consumer behavior perspective." Journal of Human Behavior and Learning, 7, 34-37.

Noddings, N. (1984) Caring: A Feminine Approach to Ethics & Moral Education. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Pascarella, E.T. and Chapman, D.W. 1983) " A multiinstitutional, path analytic valization of Tinto's model of college withdrawel." American Educational Research Journal, 20, 87-102.

Pascarella, E.T., Smart, J.C., and Ethington, C.A. (1986). "Long-term persistence of two-year college students." Research in Higher Education, 24, 47-71.

Pascarella, E. T. and Terenzini, P. T. (1991). How college affects students. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Pascarella, E. T., Terenzini, P.T., and Wolfle, L.M. (1986) "Orientation to College and Freshman Year Persistence/Withdrawal Decisions." Journal of Higher Education, 57, 155-175.

Pike, G.R. (1993) "The relationship between perceived learning and satisfaction with college: An alternative view. Research in Higher Education, 34, 23-40.

Pike, G. R. (1991) "The effects of background, coursework, and involvement on student's grades and satisfaction." Research in Higher Education, 32, 15-30.

Pike, G. R. (1989) "The performance-satisfaction relationship revisited: Specification and testing a structural model. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Amnerican Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Polcyn, L. J. (1986) "A two-instrument approache to student satisfaction measurement." College and University, 62.18-24.

Rand, A. (1964) "The objectivist ethics." In A. Rand (ed.), The Virture of Selfishness. New York: Signet.

Reed, J.G., Lahey, M.A., & Downey, R.G. (1984) "Development of the College Descriptive Index: A measure of student satisfaction." Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 17, 67-82.

Staats, S. and Partlo, C. (1990) "Predicting Intent to get a college degree." Journal of College Student Development, 31. 245-249.

Stinson, M.S., Scherer, M.J., and Walter, G.G. (1987) "Factors affecting persistence of deaf college students." Research in Higher Education, 27, 244-258.

Spady, W. (1970). Dropout from higher education: An inter-disciplinary review and synthesis. Interchange, 1, 64-85.

Spady, W. (1971). Dropouts from higher education: Toward an empirical model. Interchange, 2, 38-62.

Winteler, A. (1983). "Causal Modelling in Evaluation Research." Higher Education, 12. 315-329.

Table 1
Latent and measured model variables[1]

Latent Variables	Measured Survey Variables
Criterion Variable	
SATISFACTION	Sat1 - To what extent do you find real satisfaction in being a student? Sat2* - To what extent do you consider being a student rather unpleasant? Sat3* - To what extent to you definitely dislike being a student?
Background	
ENCOURAGEMENT	Encpar - To what extent do your parents encourage you to attend this institution?
FINANCES	Fin1 - How certain are of funds for next year? Fin2 - How certain of funds are you of funds to graduate?
FATHER'S EDUCATION	Poped - What is your fathers highest level of education?
Academic and Institutional Environment	
ACADEMIC CONFIDENCE	Consuc - To what extent are you confident of being a successful student? Constud - To what extent are you confident of your study skills? Conmath - To what extent are you confident of your mathematics skills? Conwrit - To what extent are you confident of your writing ability?
INSTITUTIONAL QUALITY	Edqual - How good of an education do you get at this institution? Insqual - How high is the quality of this institution?

[1] * Means the survey responses were numerically reversed. All variables were measured with a minimum value of 1 and a maximum of 5, except for intent to leave (1 to 5.5), institutional quality (1 to 5.5), number of best friends (a count), and advisor and faculty contact 1 (a count). For the drop variable 1 means.

Table 1, continued
Latent and measured model variables

Latent Variables	Measured Survey Variables
Academic and Institutional Environment, continued	
MAJOR-CAREER CERTAINTY	Majcert - How certain are you of your major? Jobcert - How certain are you of your career plans?
COURSES	Courses - To what extent does this institution offer the courses you want? Apexcit - To what extent are your courses exciting? Apstim - To what extent are your courses stimulating? Apdul* - To what extent are your courses dull? Apbor* - To what extent are your courses boring?
ONCAMPUS	Housing - Housing off campus or on?
Social/Relational Environment	
ADVISOR CONTACT	Advcon0 - How many times a semester have you met with an advisor? Advcon - To what extent did you talk with an advisor about academic, career, or personal counseling? Advsoc - To what extent do you socialize informally with an advisor?
FACULTY CONTACT	Faccon0 - How many times a semester have you met with a faculty member? Faccon - To what extent did you talk with faculty about academic, career, or personal counseling? Facsoc - To what extent do you socialize informally with faculty?
FRIENDS	Bestfr - How many of your best friends presently attend this institution? Sigot* - How likely is it you would leave this institution to be closer to someone you care a great deal about?

Table 2
Means and Standard Deviations

	Male (n=175)		Female (n=319)	
Variable	Mean	Std Dev	Mean	Std Dev
SAT	4.12	.78	4.30	.62
ENCPAR	4.29	.80	4.42	.77
FIN	4.08	1.03	4.16	.97
POPED	4.90	1.28	5.03	1.13
CON	3.86	.62	3.80	.63
INSTQUAL	4.00	.64	4.07	.56
MOCERT	3.84	.88	3.85	.90
COURSEOK	3.66	.49	3.66	.58
ONCAMPUS	.84	.36	.86	.35
ADVCON	2.30	1.53	2.44	1.34
FACCON	5.98	8.57	5.59	7.59
FRIEND	.55	1.00	.49	1.03

Table 3

Regression Coefficients
OLS Models of Honors Student Satisfaction
(B = unstandardized , Beta = standardized)

	Male (n=175)			**Female** (n=319)		
Model	R^2	Adjusted R^2		R^2	Adjusted R^2	
	.357	.313		.345	.322	
Variables	B	Beta	Sig F	B	Beta	Sig F
ENCPAR	.171	.177	.0155	.028	.035	.4761
FIN	-.033	-.044	.5137	.078	.122	.0178
POPED	.121	.201	.0027	-.003	-.006	.9083
CON	.253	.204	.0055	.228	.233	.0000
INSTQUAL	.099	.081	.2743	.177	.161	.0026
MOCERT	.198	.223	.0009	-.030	-.044	.3927
COURSEOK	.309	.197	.0083	.290	.273	.0000
ONCAMPUS	.111	.052	.4270	.306	.171	.0004
ADVCON	.032	.063	.3304	.063	.136	.0053
FACCON	.006	.064	.3352	-.002	-.019	.6987
FRIEND	.027	.034	.5934	.098	.163	.0009
(Constant)	-.549		.3151	-.880		.0129